arXiv:math/0110154v1 [math.FA] 15 Oct 2001

THE BOURGAIN ℓ^1-INDEX OF MIXED TSIRELSON SPACE

DENNY H. LEUNG AND WEE-KEE TANG

Abstract. Suppose that $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of regular families of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_0$ contains all singletons, and $(\theta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a nonincreasing null sequence in $(0,1)$. The mixed Tsirelson space $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty})$ is the completion of c_{00} with respect to the implicitly defined norm

$$\|x\| = \max\left\{ \|x\|_{\mathcal{F}_0}, \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sup \theta_n \sum_{i=1}^{k} \|E_i x\| \right\},$$

where $\|x\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} = \sup_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \|Fx\|_{\ell^1}$ and the last supremum is taken over all sequences $(E_i)_{i=1}^{k}$ in $[\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$ such that $\max E_i < \min E_{i+1}$ and $\{\min E_i : 1 \le i \le k\} \in \mathcal{F}_n$. In this paper, we compute the Bourgain ℓ^1-index of the space $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty})$. As a consequence, it is shown that if η is a countable ordinal not of the form ω^{ξ} for some limit ordinal ξ, then there is a Banach space whose ℓ^1-index is ω^{η}.

1. Introduction

Endow the power set of $\mathbb{N}$, identified with $2^{\mathbb{N}}$, with the product topology. Denote by $[\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$ the subspace consisting of all finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. A family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$ is said to be *hereditary* if $G \subseteq F \in \mathcal{F}$ implies $G \in \mathcal{F}$. It is *spreading* if whenever $F = \{n_1, \dots, n_k\} \in \mathcal{F}$, $n_1 < \cdots < n_k$, and $m_1 < \cdots < m_k$ satisfy $m_i \ge n_i$, $1 \le i \le k$, then $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\} \in \mathcal{F}$. In this case, we also say that $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\}$ is a *spreading* of F. A *regular* family is one that is hereditary, spreading and compact (as a subset of the topological space $[\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$). Let c_{00} be the vector space of all finitely supported real sequences and let (e_k) be the standard unit vector basis of c_{00}. If $\mathcal{F}$ is regular, define the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ on c_{00} by $\|\sum a_k e_k\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \sup_{F\in\mathcal{F}} \sum_{k\in F} |a_k|$. For $E \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$ and $x = \sum a_k e_k \in c_{00}$, let $Ex = \sum_{k\in E} a_k e_k \in c_{00}$. Given a sequence of regular families $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_0$ contains all singleton subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, and a nonincreasing null sequence $(\theta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $(0,1)$, the *mixed Tsirelson space* $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty})$ is the completion of c_{00} under the implicitly defined norm

$$\|x\| = \max\left\{ \|x\|_{\mathcal{F}_0}, \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sup \theta_n \sum_{i=1}^{k} \|E_i x\| \right\}, \tag{1}$$

where the last supremum is taken over all sequences $(E_i)_{i=1}^{k}$ in $[\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$ such that $\max E_i < \min E_{i+1}$ and $\{\min E_i : 1 \le i \le k\} \in \mathcal{F}_n$. The main aim of the present paper is the computation of the ℓ^1-index $I_b\left(T\left(\mathcal{F}_0,(\theta_n,\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty\right)\right)$ (defined below) in terms of the sequences $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ and $(\theta_n)_{n=1}^\infty$. It follows from our work (see Corollary 15 below) that if η is a countable ordinal not of the form ω^ξ for some limit ordinal ξ, then there is a Banach space whose ℓ^1-index is ω^η. This answers Question 1 in [8].

Our starting point is a comparison of normalized block basic sequences in $T(\mathcal{F}_0,(\theta_n,\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$ with subsequences of the unit vector basis in related mixed Tsirelson spaces (Proposition 3). In particular, we obtain in Corollary 8 that every normalized block basic sequence in a mixed Tsirelson space $T(\mathcal{F}_0,(\theta_n,\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\ell)$ defined by finitely many families is equivalent to a subsequence of the unit vector basis in the same space. This result was proved for the Figiel-Johnson Tsirelson space in [5] and for certain generalized Tsirelson spaces in [3]. Our approach may be considered as a descendant of that in [3].

In §3, the comparison result is used to obtain bounds on the ℓ^1-index. In §4, we introduce a method of constructing ℓ^1-trees of large index. This is a two-step method whereby many $\ell^1(n)$-block basic sequences are first constructed (Lemma 20) and these are then condensed into ℓ^1-trees by a compactness argument (Lemma 21).

If M is an infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$, denote the set of all finite, respectively infinite, subsets of M by $[M]^{<\infty}$, respectively $[M]$. If E and F are finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, we write $E < F$, respectively $E \leq F$, to mean $\max E < \min F$, respectively $\max E \leq \min F$ ($\max\emptyset = 0$ and $\min\emptyset = \infty$). We abbreviate $\{n\} < E$ and $\{n\} \leq E$ to $n < E$ and $n \leq E$ respectively. Given $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$, a sequence of finite subsets $\{E_1,\dots,E_n\}$ of $\mathbb{N}$ is said to be $\mathcal{F}$-*admissible* if $E_1 < \cdots < E_n$ and $\{\min E_1,\dots,\min E_n\} \in \mathcal{F}$. If $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are regular subsets of $[\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$, we let

$$\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}] = \{\cup_{i=1}^k F_i : F_i \in \mathcal{N} \text{ for all } i \text{ and } \{F_1,\dots,F_k\} \text{ is } \mathcal{M}\text{-admissible}\}.$$

Given a sequence of regular families $(\mathcal{M}_i)$, we define inductively $[\mathcal{M}_1,\mathcal{M}_2] = \mathcal{M}_1[\mathcal{M}_2]$ and $[\mathcal{M}_1,\dots,\mathcal{M}_{i+1}] = [\mathcal{M}_1,\dots,\mathcal{M}_i][\mathcal{M}_{i+1}]$. Also, let

$$(\mathcal{M}_1,\dots,\mathcal{M}_k) = \left\{\cup_{i=1}^k M_i : M_i \in \mathcal{M}_i, M_1 < \cdots < M_k\right\}.$$

We abbreviate the k-fold construction $(\mathcal{M},\dots,\mathcal{M})$ as $(\mathcal{M})^k$. Of primary importance are the Schreier classes as defined in [1]. We will need a slightly extended version of such classes. Suppose that $g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is a function increasing to ∞. Let $\mathcal{S}_0^g = \{\{n\} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_1^g = \{F \subseteq \mathbb{N} : |F| \leq g(\min F)\}$. Here $|F|$ denotes the cardinality of F. The higher Schreier classes are defined inductively as follows. $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha+1}^g = \mathcal{S}_1^g[\mathcal{S}_\alpha^g]$ for all $\alpha < \omega_1$. If α is a countable limit ordinal, choose a sequence (α_n) strictly increasing to α and set

$$\mathcal{S}_\alpha^g = \{F : F \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_n}^g \text{ for some } n \leq g(|F|)\}.$$

If g is the identity function, then we obtain the usual Schreier classes, and we abbreviate $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^g$ to $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$. It is clear that $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^g$ is a regular family for all $\alpha < \omega_1$.

If $M = (m_1, m_2, \dots)$ is a subsequence of $\mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(M) = \{\{m_i : i \in F\} : F \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha\}$. Since $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ is spreading, $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(M) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\alpha$.

The norm in a mixed Tsirelson space can be computed in terms of trees ([3], [10]). A *tree* in $[\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$ is a finite collection of elements (E_i^m), $0 \le m \le r$, $1 \le i \le k(m)$, in $[\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$ so that for each m, $E_1^m < E_2^m < \cdots < E_{k(m)}^m$, and that every E_i^{m+1} is a subset of some E_j^m. The elements E_i^m are called *nodes* of the tree. Any node E_i^m is said to be of *level m.* Nodes at level 0 are called *roots.* If $E_i^n \subseteq E_j^m$ and $n > m$, we say that E_i^n is a *descendant* of E_j^m and E_j^m is an *ancestor* of E_i^n. If, in the above notation, $n = m+1$, then E_i^n is said to be an *immediate successor* of E_j^m, and E_j^m the *immediate predecessor* of E_i^n. Nodes with no descendants are called *terminal nodes* or *leaves* of the tree. Given a node E in a tree $\mathcal{T}$, denote by $\mathcal{T}_E$ the subtree consisting of the node E together with all its descendants. A tree (E_i^m), $0 \le m < r$, $1 \le i \le k(m)$, is $(\mathcal{F}_n)$-admissible if $k(0) = 1$ and for every m and i, the collection $\left(E_j^{m+1}\right)$ of all immediate successors of E_i^m is an $\mathcal{F}_n$-admissible collection for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Given an $(\mathcal{F}_n)$-admissible tree (E_i^m), we define the *history* of the individual nodes inductively as follows. Let $h\left(E_1^0\right) = (0)$. If $h(E_i^m)$ has been defined and the collection $\left(E_j^{m+1}\right)$ of all immediate successors of E_i^m forms an $\mathcal{F}_n$-admissible collection, then define $h\left(E_j^{m+1}\right)$ to be the $(m+2)$- tuple $(h(E_i^m), n)$ and let $n\left(E_j^{m+1}\right) = n$ for each immediate successor E_j^{m+1} of E_i^m. Finally, assign ((θ_n)-compatible) *tags* to the nodes by defining $t(E_i^m) = \prod_{j=0}^m \theta_{n_j}$ if $h(E_i^m) = (n_0, n_1, \dots, n_m)$ $(\theta_0 = 1)$. If $x \in c_{00}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ is an $(\mathcal{F}_n)$-admissible tree, let $\mathcal{T}x = \sum t(E) \|Ex\|$, where the sum is taken over all leaves in $\mathcal{T}$. It is easily observed that $\|x\| = \max\{\mathcal{T}x : \mathcal{T} \text{ is an } (\mathcal{F}_n)\text{-admissible tree}\}$. An $(\mathcal{F}_n)$-admissible tree is said to be *complete* (for a particular $x \in c_{00}$) if $\|Ex\| = \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{F}_0}$ for every leaf E in $\mathcal{T}$. Clearly, for every $x \in c_{00}$, there is a complete tree $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\|x\| = \mathcal{T}x$. Let us observe that if we define $\|x\|$ to be $\sup \sum t(E)\|Ex\|_{\mathcal{F}_0}$, where the sup is taken over all $(\mathcal{F}_n)$-admissible trees $\mathcal{T}$ and the sum is taken over all leaves E in $\mathcal{T}$, then the resulting norm satisfies the implicit equation (1).

Proposition 1. *Let $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$ be as above. Choose a strictly increasing sequence of integers $(m_k)_{k=0}^\infty$ such that $m_0 = 0$ and $\theta_{m_{k+1}} \le \frac{1}{2}\theta_{m_k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $m_{k-1} < n \le m_k$, let $\mathcal{G}_n = \{F \in \mathcal{F}_n : k \le F\} \cup \mathcal{S}_0$. Then $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$ is isomorphic to $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{G}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$ via the formal identity.*

Proof. Denote the norms on $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$ and $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{G}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$ by $\|\cdot\|$ and $|||\cdot|||$ respectively. Clearly, $|||x||| \le \|x\|$ for all $x \in c_{00}$. Given a fixed element $x \in c_{00}$, let $\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{F}}$ denote a complete $(\mathcal{F}_n)$-admissible tree such that $\|x\| = \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{F}}x$. If F is a node of $\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{F}}$ other than the root, let $G_F = F \cap [k, \infty)$, where k is the unique integer such that $m_{k-1} < \max\{n_1, \dots, n_r\} \le m_k$,

$h(F) = (0, n_1, \dots, n_r)$. If F is the root of $\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{F}}$, let $G_F = F$. Then $\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{G}} = \left\{G_F : F \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{F}}\right\}$ is a $(\mathcal{G}_n)$-admissible tree. For any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{L}_r$ be the set of level r leaves in $\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{F}}$. Arrange the elements in $\mathcal{L}_r$ from left to right as $F_1 < F_2 < \cdots < F_\ell$. If $1 \leq j \leq \ell$, write $h(F_j) = (0, n_{j1}, , \dots, n_{jr})$ and determine k_j such that $m_{k_j - 1} < \max\{n_{j1}, \dots, n_{jr}\} \leq m_{k_j}$. If $k_j \leq j$, then $k_j \leq j \leq F_j$. Thus $G_{F_j} = F_j \cap [k_j, \infty) = F_j$. Otherwise, $j < k_j$, and hence

$$t(F_j) \|F_j x\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \leq \theta_{n_{j1}} \dots \theta_{n_{jr}} \|x\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \leq \theta_1^{r-1} \theta_{m_{k_j - 1}} \|x\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \leq \theta_1^{r-1} \theta_{m_j} \|x\|_{\mathcal{F}_0}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{F \in \mathcal{L}_r} t(F) \|Fx\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} &\leq \sum_{\{j : j < k_j\}} \theta_1^{r-1} \theta_{m_j} \|x\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} + \sum_{\{j : k_j \leq j\}} t\left(G_{F_j}\right) \left\|G_{F_j} x\right\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \\
&\leq \theta_1^{r-1} \|x\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{m_j} + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{L}_r} t(G_F) \|G_F x\|_{\mathcal{F}_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x\| = \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{F}} x &= \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{L}_r} t(F) \|Fx\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \\
&\leq \|x\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \theta_1^{r-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \theta_{m_j} + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{L}_r} t(G_F) \|G_F x\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \\
&\leq \frac{2\theta_{m_1}}{1 - \theta_1} |||x||| + |||x||| = \left(\frac{2\theta_{m_1}}{1 - \theta_1} + 1\right) |||x|||.
\end{aligned}$$

□

If $\mathcal{F}$ is a closed subset of $[\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$, let $\mathcal{F}'$ be the set of all limit points of $\mathcal{F}$. Define a transfinite sequence of sets $(\mathcal{F}^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha < \omega_1}$ as follows: $\mathcal{F}^{(0)} = \mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{F}^{(\alpha+1)} = (\mathcal{F}^{(\alpha)})'$ for all $\alpha < \omega_1$; $\mathcal{F}^{(\alpha)} = \cap_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{F}^{(\beta)}$ if α is a countable limit ordinal. If $\mathcal{F}$ is regular, we let $\iota(\mathcal{F})$ be the unique ordinal α such that $\mathcal{F}^{(\alpha)} = \{\emptyset\}$. It is well known that $\iota(\mathcal{S}_\gamma) = \omega^\gamma$ for all $\gamma < \omega_1$ [1, Proposition 4.10]. The same is true if $\mathcal{S}_\gamma$ is replaced by any $\mathcal{S}_\gamma^g$.

From now on, we fix a sequence of regular families $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ such that $\mathcal{S}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_0$, and a nonincreasing null sequence $(\theta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $(0, 1)$. Denote the mixed Tsirelson space $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty})$ by X. Let $\alpha_n = \iota(\mathcal{F}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. There is no loss of generality in assuming that $\alpha_n > 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty})$ is obviously isometric to $T\left(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \cup_{k=1}^{n} \mathcal{F}_k)_{n=1}^{\infty}\right)$ via the formal identity, we may also assume that $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a nondecreasing sequence. In the notation of Proposition 1, $\iota(\mathcal{G}_n) = \iota(\mathcal{F}_n) = \alpha_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It is straightforward to check that $\cup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_n$ is a regular family. Relabelling each $\mathcal{G}_n$ as $\mathcal{F}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we may henceforth assume that $\mathcal{S}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and that $\mathcal{F} = \cup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_n$ is regular. Denote $\sup\limits_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_n$ by α. Note that $\iota(\cup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_n) = \alpha \vee \alpha_0$.

2. An estimate on the norm

Lemma 2. *Let* $\mathcal{G}$ *and* $\mathcal{H}$ *be regular families. Suppose* $\bigcup_{j=1}^{k} F_j \in \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{H}]$, *where* $F_1 < F_2 < \cdots < F_k$. *If* $F_j \notin \mathcal{H}$ *for all* j, $1 \leq j \leq k$, *then* $\{\min F_1, \ldots, \min F_k\} \in \mathcal{G}$.

Proof. For any nonempty set $G \in \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{H}]$, let $\mathcal{H}(G) = G \cap [1,n]$, where n is the largest integer in G such that $G \cap [1,n] \in \mathcal{H}$. There is a unique decomposition $G = \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} G_j$, where $G_1, \ldots, G_k \neq \emptyset$ and $G_1 = \mathcal{H}(G)$, $G_{j+1} = \mathcal{H}(G \setminus (G_1 \cup \cdots \cup G_j))$, $1 \leq j < k$. We claim that $\{\min G_1, \ldots, \min G_k\} \in \mathcal{G}$. To see this, note that since $G \in \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{H}]$, we can write $G = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} H_i$, where $H_1 < \cdots < H_\ell$, $H_1, \ldots, H_\ell \in \mathcal{H}$, and $\{\min H_1, \ldots, \min H_\ell\} \in \mathcal{G}$. Clearly, $H_1 \subseteq G_1$. If $k \geq 2$, then $\min H_2 \leq \min G_2$. If $\max H_2 > \max G_2$, then $G_2 \subsetneqq H_2 \subseteq G$. In particular, $G_3 \neq \emptyset$ and $\min G_3 \in H_2$. Therefore, $G_2 \cup \{\min G_3\} \in \mathcal{H}$, contrary to the fact that $G_2 = \mathcal{H}(G \setminus G_1)$. Thus $\max H_2 \leq \max G_2$. Continuing this argument, we conclude that $\max H_r \leq \max G_r$ for all $1 \leq r \leq k$. It follows that $\{\min G_1, \ldots, \min G_k\}$ is a spreading of $\{\min H_1, \ldots, \min H_k\} \in \mathcal{G}$. Hence $\{\min G_1, \ldots, \min G_k\} \in \mathcal{G}$.

Now suppose that $F_1, \ldots, F_k$ are as in the statement of the lemma. Let $G_j = \mathcal{H}(F_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq k$, and let $G = G_1 \cup \cdots \cup G_k$. Since $G_j \subseteq F_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$, $G \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} F_j \in \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{H}]$. Note that $F_j \notin \mathcal{H}$ implies $G_j \subsetneqq F_j$. Therefore, $\mathcal{H}(G) = G_1$ and

$$\mathcal{H}(G \setminus (G_1 \cup \cdots \cup G_j)) = G_{j+1}, \ 1 \leq j \leq k.$$

From the previous paragraph, we conclude that $\{\min G_1, \ldots, \min G_k\} \in \mathcal{G}$. Hence $\{\min F_1, \ldots, \min F_k\} = \{\min G_1, \ldots, \min G_k\} \in \mathcal{G}$. ☐

Proposition 3. *Suppose* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $\mathcal{G}$ *is a regular family. Assume that there exists* $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that for all* $m \geq m_0$, *there exist* $n_1, \ldots, n_s \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $\theta_m < \varepsilon \theta_{n_1} \ldots \theta_{n_s}$ *and* $\mathcal{F}_m \subseteq [\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$. *Then there exists a constant* $K = K(\varepsilon, m_0) < \infty$ *such that for any normalized block basic sequence* $(x_k)_{k=1}^{p}$ *in* X *and any real sequence* $(a_k)_{k=1}^{p}$,

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k x_k \right\| \leq K \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k e_{i_k} \right\| + 2\varepsilon \rho_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k e_{i_k} \right) + 2\rho_2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k e_{i_k} \right) + 2\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{p} |a_k|, \tag{2}$$

where $i_k = \max \operatorname{supp} x_k$, $1 \leq k \leq p$, *and* ρ_1 *and* ρ_2 *are the norms on the mixed Tsirelson spaces* $T(\mathcal{F}, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty})$ *and* $T(\mathcal{G}, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty})$ *respectively.*

Proof. With the given notation, let $x = \sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k x_k$ and $y = \sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k e_{i_k}$. Also let G_k be the integer interval $(i_{k-1}, i_k]$ $(i_0 = 0)$. Since $x \in c_{00}$, there exists a complete $(\mathcal{F}_n)$-admissible tree $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\|x\| = \mathcal{T}x$. Each node $E \in \mathcal{T}$ may be assumed to be contained in the integer interval $[1, i_p]$. Call a node E *long* if $E \cap G_k \neq \emptyset$ for at least two values of k. Otherwise, term the node *short.* Let N be the smallest number such that $\theta_N \leq \varepsilon$. Take $\mathcal{E}_1$ to be the collection of all minimal elements in the set of all long nodes $E \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $n(E) > N$. Minimality is taken with respect to the order (reverse inclusion) in the tree $\mathcal{T}$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{E}_2$ be the collection of all minimal elements of the set of all short nodes that are not in $\cup \{\mathcal{T}_E : E \in \mathcal{E}_1\}$. Then let $\mathcal{E}_3$ be the set of all leaves in $\mathcal{T}$ that are not in $\cup \{\mathcal{T}_E : E \in \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \mathcal{E}_2\}$. Observe that

$$\mathcal{T}x \leq \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_j} t(E) \|Ex\|$$

The proof of the proposition is completed by combining Lemmas 4, 5, 6, and 7 below. □

Lemma 4. $\sum\limits_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} t(E) \|Ex\| \leq 2\varepsilon \sum\limits_{k=1}^{p} |a_k|$.

Proof. Arrange the nodes in $\mathcal{E}_1$ from left to right as $E_1 < \cdots < E_r$. Since $n(E_j) > N$, $t(E_j) < \theta_N \leq \varepsilon$. For $1 \leq j \leq r$, let $J_j = \{k : G_k \cap E_j \neq \emptyset\}$. Then $J_1 \leq \cdots \leq J_r$, and $|J_j| \geq 2$ for all j. Hence $\sum_{j=1}^{r} \sum_{k \in J_j} |a_k| \leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^{p} |a_k|$. It follows that

$$\sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1} t(E) \|Ex\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{r} t(E_j) \sum_{k \in J_j} |a_k| \leq \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{r} \sum_{k \in J_j} |a_k| \leq 2\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{p} |a_k|.$$

□

Lemma 5. $\sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_3} t(E) \|Ex\| \leq 2 \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k e_{i_k} \right\|$.

Proof. Since any node $E \in \mathcal{E}_3$ is a leaf in the complete tree $\mathcal{T}$ for x, $\|Ex\| = \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{F}_0}$. Choose $E_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ such that $E_0 \subseteq E$ and $\|Ex\| = \|E_0 x\| = \|E_0 x\|_{\ell^1}$. Let $J_E = \{k : G_k \cap E_0 \neq \emptyset\}$. For each $k \in J_E$, choose $j_k \in G_k \cap E_0$ and set $z = \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_3} \sum_{k \in J_E} a_k e_{j_k}$. Because each $E \in \mathcal{E}_3$ is a long node, each k belongs to at most two J_E. It follows that $\|z\| \leq 2 \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k e_{i_k} \right\|$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_3} t(E) \|Ex\| &= \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_3} t(E) \|E_0 x\| \leq \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_3} t(E) \sum_{k \in J_E} |a_k| \\
&\leq \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_3} t(E) \|E_0 z\|_{\ell^1} \leq \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_3} t(E) \|Ez\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \\
&\leq \|z\| \leq 2 \Big\| \sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k e_{i_k} \Big\|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Observe that any ancestor F of any node in $\mathcal{E}_2$ must be a long node such that $n(F) \leq N$. Subdivide $\mathcal{E}_2$ into two parts $\mathcal{E}_{21}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{22}$ according to whether the node E in question satisfies $n(E) > N$ or $n(E) \leq N$.

Lemma 6. $\sum\limits_{E\in\mathcal{E}_{21}} t(E)\|Ex\| \le \frac{2}{\theta_{m_0}}\|y\| + 2\varepsilon\rho_1(y) + 2\rho_2(y)$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of all nodes that are immediate predecessors of some node in $\mathcal{E}_{21}$. Let us first show that any two distinct nodes D and D' in $\mathcal{D}$ are mutually incomparable. Indeed, suppose that D is an ancestor of D'. Let E and E' be immediate successors of D and D' respectively that are in $\mathcal{E}_{21}$. Consider the immediate successor D'' of D such that $D'' \supseteq D'$. Since D'' and E are both immediate successors of D, $n(D'') = n(E)$. But $n(D'') \le N$ since D'' is an ancestor of $E' \in \mathcal{E}_{21}$, while $n(E) > N$ by definition of $\mathcal{E}_{21}$. Thus D and D' must be mutually incomparable. List the elements in $\mathcal{D}$ from left to right as $D_1 < D_2 < \cdots < D_r$. If $1 \le j \le r$ and $1 \le k \le p$, let $\mathcal{D}_{jk} = \{E \in \mathcal{E}_{21} : E \subseteq D_j \cap G_k\}$ and $J_j = \{k : \mathcal{D}_{jk} \ne \emptyset\}$. By the preceding argument, each E in $\bigcup_{k\in J_j}\mathcal{D}_{jk}$ is an immediate successor of D_j. Given $k \in J_j$, choose $E_{jk} \in \mathcal{D}_{jk}$ and $\ell_{jk} \in E_{jk}$. As in the proof of Lemma 5, note that each k belongs to at most two J_j because each D_j is a long node. Hence $\|w\| \le 2\|y\|$ and $\rho_i(w) \le 2\rho_i(y)$, $i = 1, 2$, where $w = \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{k\in J_j} a_k e_{\ell_{jk}}$. For each j, let $m = m(j)$ be the common value of $n(E)$ for all $E \in \bigcup_{k\in J_j}\mathcal{D}_{jk}$. In particular, $\bigcup_{k\in J_j}\mathcal{D}_{jk}$ is $\mathcal{F}_m$-admissible. Consider the set $M = \{j : m(j) < m_0\}$. If $j \in M$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k\in J_j}\sum_{E\in\mathcal{D}_{jk}} t(E)\|Ex\| &= \sum_{k\in J_j} t(D_j)\,\theta_m \sum_{E\in\mathcal{D}_{jk}}\|Ex\| \le t(D_j)\sum_{k\in J_j}|a_k| \\ &\le \frac{t(D_j)}{\theta_{m_0}}\theta_m \sum_{k\in J_j}\sum_{E\in\mathcal{D}_{jk}}\|E(D_j w)\|_{\mathcal{S}_0} \\ &\le \frac{t(D_j)}{\theta_{m_0}}\|D_j w\|.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j\in M}\sum_{k\in J_j}\sum_{E\in\mathcal{D}_{jk}} t(E)\|Ex\| &\le \frac{1}{\theta_{m_0}}\sum_{j\in M} t(D_j)\|D_j w\| \\ &\le \frac{1}{\theta_{m_0}}\|w\| \le \frac{2}{\theta_{m_0}}\|y\|.\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

If $j \notin M$, choose $n_1, \dots, n_s \in \mathbb{N}$ as in the hypothesis of Proposition 3. Note that $I_j = \{\ell_{jk} : k \in J_j\} \in \mathcal{F}_m$. Partition J_j into J_j' and J_j'' so that J_j' consists of all $k \in J_j$ such that $\mathcal{D}_{jk}$ is $[\mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$-admissible and $J_j'' = J_j \setminus J_j'$.

Set $I'_j = \{\ell_{jk} : k \in J'_j\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k\in J'_j}\sum_{E\in\mathcal{D}_{jk}} t(E)\,\|Ex\| &= t(D_j)\sum_{k\in J'_j}\theta_m \sum_{E\in\mathcal{D}_{jk}}\|Ex\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon t(D_j)\sum_{k\in J'_j}\theta_{n_1}\ldots\theta_{n_s}\sum_{E\in\mathcal{D}_{jk}}\|Ex\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon t(D_j)\sum_{k\in J'_j}|a_k| \leq \varepsilon t(D_j)\left\|I'_j(D_j w)\right\|_{\ell^1} \\ &\leq \varepsilon t(D_j)\,\|D_j w\|_{\mathcal{F}_m} \leq \varepsilon t(D_j)\,\|D_j w\|_{\mathcal{F}}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j\notin M}\sum_{k\in J'_j}\sum_{E\in\mathcal{D}_{jk}} t(E)\,\|Ex\| &\leq \varepsilon\sum_{j=1}^{r} t(D_j)\,\|D_j w\|_{\mathcal{F}} \\ &\leq \varepsilon\rho_1(w) \leq 2\varepsilon\rho_1(y)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

On the other hand, since $\bigcup_{k\in J''_j}\mathcal{D}_{jk}$ is $\mathcal{F}_m$- and thus $[\mathcal{G},\mathcal{F}_{n_1},\ldots,\mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$-admissible, while $\mathcal{D}_{jk}$ is not $[\mathcal{F}_{n_1},\ldots,\mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$-admissible for all $k\in J''_j$,

$$\left\{\min\cup_{E\in\mathcal{D}_{jk}}E : k\in J''_j\right\}\in\mathcal{G}$$

by Lemma 2. Thus $I''_j = \left\{\ell_{jk} : k\in J''_j\right\}\in\mathcal{G}$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k\in J''_j}\sum_{E\in\mathcal{D}_{jk}} t(E)\,\|Ex\| &= t(D_j)\sum_{k\in J''_j}\theta_m\sum_{E\in\mathcal{D}_{jk}}\|Ex\| \leq t(D_j)\sum_{k\in J''_j}|a_k| \\ &\leq t(D_j)\left\|I''_j(D_j w)\right\|_{\ell^1} \leq t(D_j)\,\|D_j w\|_{\mathcal{G}}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{j\notin M}\sum_{k\in J''_j}\sum_{E\in\mathcal{D}_{jk}} t(E)\,\|Ex\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{r} t(D_j)\,\|D_j w\|_{\mathcal{G}} \leq \rho_2(w) \leq 2\rho_2(y)\,. \tag{5}$$

Combining inequalities (3), (4) and (5) completes the proof. □

Lemma 7. $\sum\limits_{E\in\mathcal{E}_{22}} t(E)\,\|Ex\| \leq \frac{2}{\theta_N}\,\|y\|$.

Proof. For $1\leq k\leq p$, let $\mathcal{E}_{22}(k) = \{E\in\mathcal{E}_{22} : E\subseteq G_k\}$. If $\mathcal{E}_{22}(k)\neq\emptyset$, denote by $\mathcal{P}_k$ the collection of all minimal elements in the set of all nodes that are immediate predecessors of some node in $\mathcal{E}_{22}(k)$. Observe that if $P\in\mathcal{P}_k$, then P is a long node and $P\cap G_k\neq\emptyset$. Hence $|\mathcal{P}_k|\leq 2$. For each $P\in\mathcal{P}_k$, choose an immediate successor E_P of P such that $E_P\in\mathcal{E}_{22}(k)$, then fix $j_P\in E_P$. Note that the nodes in $\{E_P : P\in\cup_{k=1}^{p}\mathcal{P}_k\}$ are pairwise disjoint. Set $v = \sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k\sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}_k} e_{j_P}$. Since $|\mathcal{P}_k|\leq 2$, $\|v\|\leq 2\,\|y\|$. Notice that $t(E_P) = \theta_{n(E_P)} t(P) \geq \theta_N t(P)$ since $E \in \mathcal{E}_{22}$ implies $n(E_P) \leq N$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{E\in\mathcal{E}_{22}} t(E)\,\|Ex\| &= \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{E\in\mathcal{E}_{22}(k)} t(E)\,\|Ex\| = \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}_k} \sum_{\substack{E\in\mathcal{E}_{22}(k)\\ E\subseteq P}} t(E)\,\|Ex\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}_k} t(P)\,\|P(G_k x)\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}_k} t(P)\,|a_k| \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}_k} t(P)\,\|E_P v\|_{\mathcal{S}_0} \leq \frac{1}{\theta_N} \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}_k} t(E_P)\,\|E_P v\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\theta_N}\|v\| \leq \frac{2}{\theta_N}\|y\|.\end{aligned}$$

□

Observe that in the preceding proof, the hypothesis of Proposition 3 (that is, the existence of the family $\mathcal{G}$) is used only in Lemma 6. One may consider mixed Tsirelson spaces $Z = T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^{\ell})$ determined by finitely many regular families, defined in the obvious way. For such spaces, it is worthwhile to observe the following corollary of the proof of Proposition 3.

Corollary 8. *Let the space Z be as above. There exists a constant $K < \infty$ such that for any normalized block basic sequence $(x_k)_{k=1}^{p}$ in Z and any $(a_k) \in c_{00}$,*

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k e_{i_k}\right\| \leq \left\|\sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k x_k\right\| \leq K \left\|\sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k e_{i_k}\right\|,$$

where $i_k = \max\operatorname{supp} x_k$, $1 \leq k \leq p$.

Proof. If $j_k = \min\operatorname{supp} x_k$, $1 \leq k \leq p$, then

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k e_{i_k}\right\| \leq \left\|\sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k e_{j_k}\right\| \leq \left\|\sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k x_k\right\|.$$

On the other hand, in the notation of the proof of Proposition 3, take $N = \ell$. Then $\mathcal{E}_1 = \mathcal{E}_{21} = \emptyset$. In particular, the hypothesis in Proposition 3 is no longer required since Lemma 6 is not needed any more. Lemmas 5 and 7 give the desired result. □

3. Bounds on the ℓ^1-index

Let us recall the relevant terminology concerning trees. A *tree* on a set S is a subset T of $\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} S^n$ such that $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in T$ whenever $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \in T$. If $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in T$ and $1 \leq m < n$, the sequence $(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is said to be an ancestor of $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. A tree T is *well-founded* if there is no infinite sequence (x_n) in S such that $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in T$ for all n. Given a well-founded tree T, we define the *derived tree* $D(T)$

to be the set of all $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in T$ such that $(x_1, \dots, x_n, x) \in T$ for some $x \in S$. Inductively, we let $D^0(T) = T$, $D^{\alpha+1}(T) = D(D^\alpha(T))$, and $D^\alpha(T) = \cap_{\beta<\alpha} D^\beta(T)$ if α is a limit ordinal. The *order* of a well-founded tree T is the smallest ordinal $o(T)$ such that $D^{o(T)}(T) = \emptyset$. If E is a Banach space and $1 \leq K < \infty$, an ℓ^1-K tree on E is a tree T on $S(E) = \{x \in E : \|x\| = 1\}$ such that $\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i\| \geq K^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|$ whenever $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in T$ and $(a_i) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. If E has a basis (e_i), a *block tree* on E is a tree T on E so that every $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in T$ is a finite block basis of (e_i). An ℓ^1-K-block tree on E is a block tree that is also an ℓ^1-K tree. The index $I(E, K)$ is defined to be $\sup\{o(T) : T \text{ is an } \ell^1\text{-}K \text{ tree on } E\}$. If E has a basis (e_i), the index $I_b(E, K)$ is defined similarly, with the supremum taken over all ℓ^1-K block trees. The Bourgain ℓ^1-*index* of E is the ordinal $I(E) = \sup\{I(E, K) : 1 \leq K < \infty\}$. The index $I_b(E)$ is defined similarly. Bourgain proved that if E is a separable Banach space not containing a copy of ℓ^1, then $I(E) < \omega_1$ [4]. Judd and Odell [8] showed that $I(E)$ and $I_b(E)$ are closely related for a Banach space E with a basis. Precisely, if $I_b(E) = \omega^n$ for some $n < \omega$, then $I(E) = \omega^n$ or ω^{n+1}, while $I_b(E) = I(E)$ if $I_b(E) \geq \omega^\omega$. We refer the reader to [8] and [2] for in depth discussions of these and related indices.

Our concern for the rest of the paper is the calculation of the index $I_b(X)$, where X is the mixed Tsirelson space $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$. We begin with an easy lower bound on $I_b(X)$.

Proposition 9. $I_b(X) \geq \alpha_0 \cdot \sup\limits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n^\omega$.

Proof. For all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote the family $[\overbrace{\mathcal{F}_n, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n}^{m \text{ times}}, \mathcal{F}_0]$ by $\mathcal{B}_{mn}$. Observe that $\iota(\mathcal{B}_{mn}) = \alpha_0 \cdot \alpha_n^m$ for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ by [9, Proposition 10]. For any $(a_k) \in c_{00}$, $\|\sum a_k e_k\| \geq \theta_n^m \|\sum a_k e_k\|_{\mathcal{B}_{mn}}$. Thus $I_b(X, \theta_n^m) \geq \iota(\mathcal{B}_{mn}) = \alpha_0 \cdot \alpha_n^m$ for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore,

$$I_b(X) \geq \sup_{m,n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_0 \cdot \alpha_n^m = \alpha_0 \cdot \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n^\omega.$$

□

In the remainder of this section, we apply Proposition 3 to obtain an upper bound on the ℓ^1-index of X. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\mathcal{C}(n) = \{(0, n_1, \dots, n_s) : n_1, \dots, n_s, s \in \mathbb{N},\ n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_s \leq n\}$$

and

$$\pi_n = \sup\{\theta_{n_1} \dots \theta_{n_s} : n_1 + \dots + n_s > n\}.$$

Obviously $\mathcal{C}(n)$ is a finite set. Denote its cardinality by $p(n)$. It is clear that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \pi_n = 0$.

Lemma 10. *Suppose that $\mathcal{H}$ is a regular family containing $\mathcal{S}_0$ and that ρ is the norm on the space $T(\mathcal{H}, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$. For all $x \in c_{00}$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we* *have*

$$\rho(x) \leq \pi_n \|x\|_{\ell^1} + p(n) \|x\|_{\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{H}]},$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \cup_{(0,n_1,\ldots,n_s)\in\mathcal{C}(n)} [\mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$.

Proof. There exists an $(\mathcal{F}_n)$-admissible tree $\mathcal{T}$ such that

$$\rho(x) = \sum_{E\in\mathcal{L}} t(E) \, ||Ex||_{\mathcal{H}},$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is the set of all leaves of $\mathcal{T}$. Let $\mathcal{L}_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)}$ be the set of all $E \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $h(E) = (0, n_1, \ldots, n_s)$. Then

$$\rho(x) = \left(\sum_{(0,n_1,\ldots,n_s)\in\mathcal{C}(n)} + \sum_{(0,n_1,\ldots,n_s)\notin\mathcal{C}(n)} \right) \sum_{E\in\mathcal{L}_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)}} t(E) \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

If $(0, n_1, \ldots, n_s) \in \mathcal{C}(n)$, then $\mathcal{L}_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)}$ is $[\mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$-admissible and thus $\mathcal{M}$-admissible. Since $t(E) \leq 1$ for all E,

$$\sum_{E\in\mathcal{L}_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)}} t(E) \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \sum_{E\in\mathcal{L}_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)}} \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|x\|_{\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{H}]}.$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{(0,n_1,\ldots,n_s)\in\mathcal{C}(n)} \sum_{E\in\mathcal{L}_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)}} t(E) \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq p(n) \|x\|_{\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{H}]}.$$

On the other hand, since $t(E) = \theta_{n_1} \ldots \theta_{n_s} \leq \pi_n$ if $E \notin \mathcal{L}_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{(0,n_1,\ldots,n_s)\notin\mathcal{C}(n)} \sum_{E\in\mathcal{L}_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)}} t(E) \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ \leq &\sum_{(0,n_1,\ldots,n_s)\notin\mathcal{C}(n)} \sum_{E\in\mathcal{L}_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)}} \pi_n \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \pi_n \|x\|_{\ell^1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 11. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be as defined in Lemma 10, then $\iota(\mathcal{M}) \leq \alpha_n^n$.*

Proof. The lemma follows immediately from the fact that

$$\iota(\mathcal{H}[\mathcal{N}]) \leq \iota(\mathcal{N}) \cdot \iota(\mathcal{H})$$

if $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are regular families of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ (cf. [9, Proposition 10]). □

Proposition 12. ([9, Proposition 12]) *Let T be a well-founded block tree on some basis (e_i). Define*

$$\mathcal{H}(T) = \{\{\max \operatorname{supp} x_i : i = 1, \ldots, n\} : (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in T\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(T) = \{G : G \textit{ is a spreading of a subset of some } F \in \mathcal{H}(T)\}.$$

If $\mathcal{G}(T)$ is compact, then $\iota(\mathcal{G}(T)) \geq o(T)$.

Given a countable ordinal η, define the order (or the logarithm) $\ell(\eta)$ of the ordinal η to be γ_1, where $\eta = \omega^{\gamma_1} \cdot k_1 + \cdots + \omega^{\gamma_p} \cdot k_p$ in Cantor normal form. Clearly, $\ell(\eta_1 \cdot \eta_2) = \ell(\eta_1) + \ell(\eta_2)$. Therefore $\ell(\eta^n) = \ell(\eta) \cdot n$ and $\ell(\eta^\omega) = \ell(\eta) \cdot \omega$. Obviously, if $\ell(\eta) = \gamma$, then $\omega^\gamma \leq \eta < \omega^{\gamma+1}$. Observe that in the notation of Proposition 3, if we take ρ to be the norm on the space $T(\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{G}, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$, then $\|\cdot\| \leq \rho$ and $\rho_2 \leq \rho$. Thus inequality (2) implies

$$\left\|\sum_{k=1}^p a_k x_k\right\| \leq (K+2)\,\rho\left(\sum_{k=1}^p a_k e_{i_k}\right) + 4\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^p |a_k|.$$

If $(x_k)_{k=1}^n$ and $(y_k)_{k=1}^n$ are sequences in possibly different normed spaces, and $0 < K < \infty$, we write $(x_k)_{k=1}^n \overset{K}{\succeq} (y_k)_{k=1}^n$ to mean $K\left\|\sum_{k=1}^n a_k x_k\right\| \geq \left\|\sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k\right\|$ for all $(a_k) \in c_{00}$.

Proposition 13. *Suppose for all* $\varepsilon > 0$, *there exist a regular family* $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon$ *and* $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that for all* $m \geq m_0$, *there exist* $n_1, \ldots, n_s \in \mathbb{N}$ *satisfying* $\theta_m < \varepsilon\theta_{n_1}\ldots\theta_{n_s}$ *and* $\mathcal{F}_m \subseteq [\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$. *Then*

$$I_b(X) \leq \sup_{\varepsilon>0}\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\left[(\alpha_0 \vee \iota(\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon)) \cdot \alpha_n^\omega\right].$$

Proof. Suppose otherwise. There exists $H > 1$ and an ℓ^1-H-block tree T on X such that

$$o(T) > \sup_{\varepsilon>0}\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\left[(\alpha_0 \vee \iota(\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon)) \cdot \alpha_n^\omega\right].$$

Pick $\varepsilon_0 < \frac{1}{8H}$. According to Proposition 3 and the remark above, there exists a constant K such that

$$\left\|\sum_{k=1}^n a_k x_k\right\| \leq K\rho\left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k e_{i_k}\right) + 4\varepsilon_0 \sum_{k=1}^n |a_k|$$

for all $(a_k) \in c_{00}$, where ρ is the norm on $T(\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0}, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$. Let $\ell(\alpha_n) = \gamma_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\ell(\alpha_0 \vee \iota(\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0})) = \gamma$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\ell\left((\alpha_0 \vee \iota(\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0})) \cdot \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n^\omega\right) &= \ell(\alpha_0 \vee \iota(\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0})) + \ell\left(\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n^\omega\right) \\ &\geq \ell(\alpha_0 \vee \iota(\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0})) + \ell(\alpha_n^\omega) = \gamma + \gamma_n \cdot \omega\end{aligned}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence $o(T) > \omega^{\gamma+\gamma_n\cdot\omega}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Given $F \in \mathcal{H}(T)$, there exists $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in T$ such that $F = \{\max\operatorname{supp} x_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Since $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in T$, $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \overset{H}{\succeq} \ell^1(|F|)$-basis. Thus

$$K\rho\left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k e_{i_k}\right) + 4\varepsilon_0 \sum_{k=1}^n |a_k| \geq \frac{1}{H}\sum_{k=1}^n |a_k|.$$

Hence

$$\rho\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k e_{i_k}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2KH}\sum_{k=1}^{n}|a_k|\,.$$

Since it is clear that $(e_k)_{k\in G} \overset{1}{\succeq} (e_k)_{k\in F}$ whenever G is a spreading of F, it follows that

$$\rho\left(\sum_{k\in G} a_k e_k\right) \geq \frac{1}{2KH}\sum_{k\in G}|a_k| \tag{6}$$

for all $G \in \mathcal{G}(T)$. Assume that $\gamma_n \neq 0$ for some n. Choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\pi_m < 1/(4KH)$ and $\gamma_m \neq 0$. If $\mathcal{G}(T)$ is compact, then $\iota(\mathcal{G}(T)) > \omega^{\gamma+\gamma_m\cdot\omega}$ by Proposition 12. Since $\mathcal{G}(T)$ is regular, the same holds for $\mathcal{G}(T)\cap[L]^{<\infty}$ for any $L \in [\mathbb{N}]$. Thus by [7, Corollary 1.2], there exists $L \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that $\mathcal{S}_{\gamma+\gamma_m\cdot\omega}\cap[L]^{<\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{G}(T)$. The same conclusion clearly holds if $\mathcal{G}(T)$ is not compact. Hence inequality (6) holds for all $(a_k) \in c_{00}$ and all $G \in \mathcal{S}_{\gamma+\gamma_m\cdot\omega}\cap[L]^{<\infty}$. Now, defining $\mathcal{M}$ to be as in Lemma 10 corresponding to m,

$$\iota(\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{F}_0\cup\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0}]) \leq \iota(\mathcal{F}_0\cup\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0})\cdot\iota(\mathcal{M}) = (\alpha_0\vee\iota(\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0}))\cdot\alpha_m^m < \omega^{\gamma+\gamma_m\cdot m+1}.$$

Using [7, Corollary 1.2] again, we obtain $M \in [L]$ such that $\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{F}_0\cup\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0}]\cap[M]^{<\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\gamma+\gamma_m\cdot m+1}$. It follows from [11, Proposition 3.6] that there are $F \in \mathcal{S}_{\gamma+\gamma_m\cdot\omega}(M)$ and $(a_j)_{j\in F} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\sum_{j\in F} a_j = 1$ and if $G \subseteq F$ with $G \in \mathcal{S}_{\gamma+\gamma_m\cdot m+1}$, then $\sum_{j\in G} a_j < \frac{1}{4p(m)KH}$. Note that $F \in \mathcal{S}_{\gamma+\gamma_m\cdot\omega}\cap[M]^{<\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{G}(T)$. Consider $x = \sum_{j\in F} a_j e_j$. By Lemma 10,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(x) &\leq \pi_m\|x\|_{\ell^1} + p(m)\|x\|_{\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{F}_0\cup\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0}]}\\ &\leq \pi_m + p(m)\|x\|_{\mathcal{S}_{\gamma+\gamma_m\cdot m+1}}\\ &< \frac{1}{4KH}+\frac{1}{4KH} = \frac{1}{2KH},\end{aligned}$$

contrary to (6). This proves the proposition in case $\gamma_n \neq 0$ for some n.

If $\gamma_n = 0$ for all n, then $\alpha_n^\omega = \omega$ for all n. (Recall that we assume $\alpha_n > 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.) Write $\alpha_0\vee\iota(\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0}) = \omega^{\lambda_1}\cdot m_1+\cdots+\omega^{\lambda_k}\cdot m_k$ in Cantor normal form. Then

$$\iota(\mathcal{G}(T)) \geq o(T) > [\alpha_0\vee\iota(\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0})]\cdot\omega = \omega^{\lambda_1+1}.$$

By [7, Corollary 1.2], there exists $L \in [\mathbb{N}]$ such that $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1+1}\cap[L]^{<\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{G}(T)$. Hence, for all $(a_k) \in c_{00}$ and all $G \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1+1}\cap[L]^{<\infty}$, inequality (6) holds. Choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\pi_m < 1/(4KH)$ and define $\mathcal{M}$ as in Lemma 10 corresponding to m. Then

$$\iota(\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{F}_0\cup\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0}]) = [\alpha_0\vee\iota(\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0})]\cdot r < \omega^{\lambda_1}\cdot(m_1+1)\,r$$

for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Applying [7, Theorem 1.1], there exists $M \in [L]$ such that $\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{F}_0\cup\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0}]\cap[M]^{<\infty} \subseteq (\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1})^{(m_1+1)r}$. By [11, Proposition 3.6], there exist $F \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1+1}(M) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1+1}\cap[M]^{<\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1+1}\cap[L]^{<\infty}$ and $(a_j)_{j\in F} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$

such that $\sum_{j\in F} a_j = 1$ and if $G \subseteq F$ with $G \in \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1}$, then $\sum_{j\in G} a_j < \frac{1}{4p(m)KH(m_1+1)r}$. Consider $x = \sum_{j\in F} a_j e_j$. By Lemma 10,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(x) &\leq \pi_m \|x\|_{\ell^1} + p(m)\|x\|_{\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{F}_0\cup\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_0}]} \\ &\leq \pi_m + p(m)\|x\|_{(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1})^{(m_1+1)r}} \\ &\leq \pi_m + p(m)(m_1+1)r\|x\|_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_1}} \\ &< \frac{1}{4KH} + \frac{1}{4KH} = \frac{1}{2KH},\end{aligned}$$

contradicting (6). □

Theorem 14. 1. $\alpha_0 \cdot \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n^\omega \leq I_b(X) \leq (\alpha_0 \vee \alpha)\cdot \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n^\omega$.

2. *If* $\alpha_0 \geq \alpha$, *then* $I_b(X) = \alpha_0 \cdot \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n^\omega$.
3. *If* $\alpha_0 < \alpha$ *and* $\alpha = \alpha_n$ *for some* $n \in \mathbb{N}$, *then* $I_b(X) = \alpha^\omega$.
4. *If* $\alpha_n < \alpha$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ *and* α *is not of the form* $\alpha = \omega^{\omega^\xi}$, $\xi < \omega_1$, *then* $I_b(X) = \alpha^\omega$.

Proof. 1. The first inequality follows from Proposition 9. Since $\mathcal{S}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n$ for all n, $\mathcal{F}_m \subseteq \mathcal{F} \subseteq [\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$ for all $m, n_1, \dots, n_s \in \mathbb{N}$. The second inequality follows from Proposition 13 upon taking $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{F}$.

2. and 3. are clear.

4. In this case, it is readily verified that $\alpha \cdot \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n^\omega = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n^\omega = \alpha^\omega$. The conclusion follows from 1. □

The following corollary answers Question 1 in [8].

Corollary 15. *If* η *is a countable ordinal not of the form* ω^ξ *for some limit ordinal* $\xi < \omega_1$, *then there exists a Banach space* Y *such that* $I(Y) = \omega^\eta$.

Proof. Write $\eta = \omega^{\gamma_1}\cdot m_1 + \cdots + \omega^{\gamma_k}\cdot m_k$ in Cantor normal form. If γ_k is 0 or a successor ordinal, then the result follows immediately from [9, Corollary 14]. If γ_k is a limit ordinal, let (β_n) be a sequence of ordinals increasing to γ_k. Choose regular families $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ such that $\alpha_n = \iota(\mathcal{F}_n) = \omega^{\omega^{\beta_n}}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\alpha_0 = \iota(\mathcal{F}_0) = \omega^{\omega^{\gamma_1}\cdot m_1 + \cdots + \omega^{\gamma_k}\cdot(m_k-1)}$. Then $\alpha = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \omega^{\omega^{\beta_n}} = \omega^{\omega^{\gamma_k}} \leq \alpha_0$ as $k > 1$ or $m_k > 1$. Let $Y = T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$. By 2. in Theorem 14, $I_b(Y) = \alpha_0 \cdot \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n^\omega = \omega^{\omega^{\gamma_1}\cdot m_1 + \cdots + \omega^{\gamma_k}\cdot m_k} = \omega^\eta$. Finally, since $I_b(Y) \geq \omega^\omega$, $I(Y) = I_b(Y) = \omega^\eta$ by [8, Corollary 5.13]. □

4. ATTAINING THE UPPER BOUND

Henceforth, we shall consider only the case where $\alpha_n < \alpha$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ and α is of the form ω^{ω^ξ}. Under these conditions, Theorem 14 yields the estimate

$$\omega^{\omega^\xi} \leq I_b(X) \leq \omega^{\omega^\xi\cdot 2}.$$

The next theorem gives a sufficient condition for the upper estimate to be attained. Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, define

$$\gamma = \gamma(\varepsilon, m) = \max\{\ell(\alpha_0 \cdot \alpha_{n_s} \ldots \alpha_{n_1}) : \\ \varepsilon\theta_{n_1}\theta_{n_2}\ldots\theta_{n_s} > \theta_m\} \ (\max\emptyset = 0).$$

Theorem 16. *Assume $\xi \neq 0$. If there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $\beta < \omega^\xi$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $\gamma(\varepsilon, m) + 2 + \beta < \ell(\alpha_m)$, then $I_b(X) = \omega^{\omega^\xi \cdot 2}$.*

Before giving the proof of Theorem 16, let us observe an interesting corollary.

Corollary 17. *If ξ is a limit ordinal, then $I_b(X) = \omega^{\omega^\xi \cdot 2}$.*

Proof. Since ξ is a limit ordinal, the sequence $(\ell(\ell(\alpha_n)))$ converges to ξ. Hence for all $\beta < \xi$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\ell(\ell(\alpha_m)) > \beta \vee \ell(\ell(\alpha_{m-1})) \vee \ell(\ell(\alpha_0))$. Suppose $\theta_{n_1}\ldots\theta_{n_s} > \theta_m$ for some $n_1, \ldots, n_s \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $n_1, \ldots, n_s < m$. Now for all $1 \le i \le s$, $\alpha_{n_i} \le \omega^{\ell(\alpha_{n_i})+1}$. Thus

$$\alpha_0 \cdot \alpha_{n_s} \ldots \alpha_{n_1} \le \omega^{\ell(\alpha_0)+1+\ell(\alpha_{n_s})+1+\cdots+\ell(\alpha_{n_1})+1}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\ell(\alpha_0 \cdot \alpha_{n_s} \ldots \alpha_{n_1}) + 2 + \omega^\beta \\ &\quad \le \ell(\alpha_0) + 1 + \ell(\alpha_{n_s}) + 1 + \cdots + \ell(\alpha_{n_1}) + 1 + 2 + \omega^\beta \\ &\quad < \omega^{\ell(\ell(\alpha_m))} \le \ell(\alpha_m). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Theorem 16 with $\varepsilon = 1$ yields the required result. □

Lemma 18. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then for all $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$, there exists $x \in c_{00}$ satisfying $\|x\| \le 1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, $\|x\|_{\ell^1} = \frac{1}{\theta_m}$, and $\operatorname{supp} x \in \mathcal{S}_{\gamma+2} \cap [M]^{<\infty}$, where $\gamma = \gamma(\varepsilon, m)$ is as defined above.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{N} = \{(n_1, \ldots, n_s) : \varepsilon\theta_{n_1}\ldots\theta_{n_s} > \theta_m\}$. Clearly $\mathcal{N}$ is a finite set. Denote its cardinality by c. By assumption, there exists $L \in [M]^{<\infty}$ such that $[\mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}, \mathcal{F}_0] \cap [L]^{<\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\gamma+1}$ for all $(n_1, \ldots, n_s) \in \mathcal{N}$ (cf. [7]). By [11, Proposition 3.6], there exists $y \in c_{00}$, $\|y\|_{\ell^1} = 1$ such that $\operatorname{supp} y \in \mathcal{S}_{\gamma+2} \cap [L]^{<\infty}$ and $\|y\|_{\mathcal{S}_{\gamma+1}} \le \theta_m/c$. Let $x = y/\theta_m$. Then $\|x\|_{\ell^1} = \frac{1}{\theta_m}$ and $\operatorname{supp} x \in \mathcal{S}_{\gamma+2} \cap [M]^{<\infty}$. Choose a complete $(\mathcal{F}_n)$-admissible tree $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\|x\| = \mathcal{T}x$. Denote by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})$ the set of all leaves of $\mathcal{T}$. For a fixed $(n_1, \ldots, n_s) \in \mathcal{N}$, the set $\{E \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}) : h(E) = (0, n_1, \ldots, n_s)\}$ is $[\mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$-admissible. Since $\operatorname{supp} x \in [L]^{<\infty}$, we conclude by the choice of L that

$$\sum_{\substack{E \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}) \\ h(E) = (0, n_1, \ldots, n_s)}} \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \le \|x\|_{[\mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}, \mathcal{F}_0]} \le \|x\|_{\mathcal{S}_{\gamma+1}}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x\| &\leq \sum_{\substack{E\in\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})\\ \varepsilon t(E)\leq\theta_m}} t\left(E\right)\|Ex\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} + \sum_{\substack{E\in\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})\\ \varepsilon t(E)>\theta_m}} t\left(E\right)\|Ex\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \\
&\leq \frac{\theta_m}{\varepsilon}\|x\|_{\ell^1} + \sum_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)\in\mathcal{N}} \theta_{n_1}\theta_{n_2}\ldots\theta_{n_j} \sum_{\substack{E\in\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})\\ h(E)=(0,n_1,\ldots,n_s)}} \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \sum_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)\in\mathcal{N}} \|x\|_{\mathcal{S}_{\gamma+1}} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \frac{c}{\theta_m}\|y\|_{\mathcal{S}_{\gamma+1}} \leq 1+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Lemma 19. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 16, there exists a strictly increasing sequence* $(q_k)\subseteq\mathbb{N}$ *such that for all* $F\in\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\xi}$, *there are normalized vectors* $(x_k)_{k\in F}$ *with* $\operatorname{supp} x_k\subseteq[q_k,q_{k+1})$ *for all* $k\in F$ *and*

$$\left\|\sum_{k\in F} a_k x_k\right\| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\sum_{k\in F}|a_k|$$

for all $(a_k)\in c_{00}$.

Proof. Since $\xi\neq 0$, ω^ξ is a limit ordinal. Suppose that $\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\xi}$ is defined by the sequence (β_k) increasing to ω^ξ. For each k, choose $m_k\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $\gamma\left(\varepsilon,m_k\right)+2+\beta_k<\ell\left(\alpha_{m_k}\right)$. Write $\gamma_k=\gamma\left(\varepsilon,m_k\right)$. Using Lemma 18, obtain a strictly increasing sequence $(q_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ in $\mathbb{N}$ and $\left(x^i_k\right)_{k=1}^{i}{}_{i=1}^{\infty}\subseteq c_{00}$ such that $\left\|x^i_k\right\|_{\ell^1}=\frac{1}{\theta_{m_k}}$, $\left\|x^i_k\right\|\leq 1+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, $\operatorname{supp} x^i_k\subseteq[q_i,q_{i+1})$, and $\operatorname{supp} x^i_k\in\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_k+2}\cap[M_i]^{<\infty}$, where $M_i\in[\mathbb{N}]$ is chosen so that $M_{i+1}\subseteq M_i\cap[q_{i+1},\infty)$ and

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^{i}\mathcal{S}_{\beta_j}[\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_i+2}]\cap[M_i]^{<\infty}\subseteq\mathcal{F}_{m_i}.$$

Note that this choice is possible by [7] since

$$\iota(\cup_{j=1}^{i}\mathcal{S}_{\beta_j}\left[\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_i+2}\right])=\omega^{\gamma_i+2+\beta_i}<\omega^{\ell(\alpha_{m_i})}\leq\alpha_{m_i}=\iota\left(\mathcal{F}_{m_i}\right).$$

If $F=\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\}\in\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\xi}$, $i_1<\cdots<i_r$, then $F\in\mathcal{S}_{\beta_k}$ for some $k\leq i_1$. Consider the block basic sequence $(x^{i_1}_{i_1},x^{i_2}_{i_1},\ldots,x^{i_r}_{i_1})$. By choice, $\operatorname{supp} x^{i_j}_{i_1}\in\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_{i_1}+2}\cap[M_{i_j}]^{<\infty}$ and $\operatorname{supp} x^{i_j}_{i_1}\subseteq[q_{i_j},q_{i_j+1})$, $1\leq j\leq r$. Moreover, the set $\{q_{i_1},\ldots,q_{i_r}\}$ is a spreading of $\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\}=F$ and hence belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{\beta_k}$. Thus

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^{r}\operatorname{supp} x^{i_j}_{i_1}\in\mathcal{S}_{\beta_k}[\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_{i_1}+2}]\cap[M_{i_1}]^{<\infty}\subseteq\mathcal{F}_{m_{i_1}}.$$

Therefore, given any $(a_j) \in c_{00}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\sum_{j=1}^{r} a_j x_{i_1}^{i_j}\| &\geq \theta_{m_{i_1}} \|\sum_{j=1}^{r} a_j x_{i_1}^{i_j}\|_{\ell^1} \\ &= \theta_{m_{i_1}} \sum_{j=1}^{r} |a_j| \|x_{i_1}^{i_j}\|_{\ell^1} \\ &= \theta_{m_{i_1}} \sum_{j=1}^{r} |a_j| \frac{1}{\theta_{m_{i_1}}} = \sum_{j=1}^{r} |a_j| \,.\end{aligned}$$

Normalizing the sequence $(x_{i_1}^{i_1}, x_{i_1}^{i_2}, \ldots, x_{i_1}^{i_r})$ yields the desired result. □

Lemma 20. *Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 16 hold. Then there exists* $(q_k) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ *such that whenever* $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha_n}[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\xi}]$ *for some* $n \in \mathbb{N}$, *there are normalized vectors* $(x_k)_{k\in F}$, supp $x_k \subseteq [q_k, q_{k+1})$, *satisfying*

$$\left\|\sum_{k\in F} a_k x_k\right\| \geq \frac{\varepsilon\theta_n}{1+\varepsilon} \sum_{k\in F} |a_k|$$

for all $(a_k) \in c_{00}$.

Proof. Choose (q_k) using Lemma 19. If $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha_n}[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\xi}]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, write $F = \bigcup_{j=1}^{s} F_j$, with $F_1 < \cdots < F_s$, $F_j \in \mathcal{S}_{\omega^\xi}$, $1 \leq j \leq s$, and $\{\min F_j\}_{j=1}^{s} \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha_n}$. For all $1 \leq j \leq s$, there exist normalized vectors $(x_k)_{k\in F_j}$ such that supp $x_k \subseteq [q_k, q_{k+1})$ for all $k \in F_j$ and $\left\|\sum_{k\in F_j} a_k x_k\right\| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} \sum_{k\in F_j} |a_k|$ for any $(a_k) \in c_{00}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\sum_{k\in F} a_k x_k\right\| &= \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{s}\left(\sum_{k\in F_j} a_k x_k\right)\right\| \\ &\geq \theta_n \sum_{j=1}^{s}\left\|E_j \sum_{j=1}^{s}\left(\sum_{k\in F_j} a_k x_k\right)\right\|, \text{ where } E_j = \bigcup_{k\in F_j} \operatorname{supp} x_k \\ &= \theta_n \sum_{j=1}^{s}\left\|\sum_{k\in F_j} a_k x_k\right\| \\ &\geq \frac{\varepsilon\theta_n}{1+\varepsilon} \sum_{k\in F} |a_k|\end{aligned}$$

for any $(a_k) \in c_{00}$. □

To complete the proof of Theorem 16, we apply a compactness argument to condense the block basic sequences obtained in Lemma 20 into a tree. Let

Y be a set and let $(A_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of pairwise disjoint finite subsets of Y. Suppose that a given set

$$\mathcal{X} \subseteq \bigcup_{\emptyset \neq F \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}} \left(\prod_{n \in F} A_n \right)$$

is hereditary in the sense that $(x_n)_{n \in G} \in \mathcal{X}$ whenever $(x_n)_{n \in F} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\emptyset \neq G \subseteq F$.

Proposition 21. *Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$ be a regular family with $\omega_1 > \iota(\mathcal{H}) \geq \alpha \geq 1$. Suppose for all nonempty $F \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists $(x_n)_{n \in F} \in \mathcal{X}$. Then there exists a tree T on Y such that $T \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $o(T) \geq \alpha$.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{H}$ is regular and nonempty. There exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\{n\} \in \mathcal{H}$ for all $n \geq n_0$. By hypothesis, there exists $(x_n) \in \mathcal{X}$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Let $T = \{(x_n) : n \geq n_0\}$. Then $T \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $o(T) \geq 1$.

Suppose the proposition is true for some $\alpha \geq 1$. Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$ be a regular family satisfying the hypothesis such that $\omega_1 > \iota(\mathcal{H}) \geq \alpha + 1$. Pick a singleton set $\{n_0\} \in \mathcal{H}^{(\alpha)}$ and let

$$\mathcal{G} = \left\{ G \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty} : n_0 < G, \{n_0\} \cup G \in \mathcal{H} \right\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{G}$ is regular and $\iota(\mathcal{G}) \geq \alpha \geq 1$. Correspondingly, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y} = \{(x_n)_{n \in G} : \emptyset \neq G \in \mathcal{G}, &\text{ there exists } (x_{n_0}) \\ &\text{such that } (x_n)_{n \in \{n_0\} \cup G} \in \mathcal{X}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{X}$ is hereditary, so is $\mathcal{Y}$. Let a nonempty set $G \in \mathcal{G}$ be given. Then there exists $(x_n)_{n \in \{n_0\} \cup G} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $(x_n)_{n \in G} \in \mathcal{Y}$. By the inductive hypothesis, there exists a tree T_0 on Y such that $T_0 \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ and $o(T_0) \geq \alpha$. List the elements in A_{n_0} as $(z_{n_0}^1), \ldots, (z_{n_0}^p)$. Let M be the collection of maximal nodes of T_0. If $(x_n)_{n \in G} \in M$, there exists i, $1 \leq i \leq p$, such that $(z_{n_0}^i) \cup (x_n)_{n \in G} \in \mathcal{X}$. Partition M into $\bigcup_{i=1}^p M_i$ so that $(x_n)_{n \in G} \in M_i$ implies $(z_{n_0}^i) \cup (x_n)_{n \in G} \in \mathcal{X}$. Now let T_i be the subtree of T_0 consisting of all nodes in M_i and their ancestors. By [8, Lemma 5.10], there exists i such that $o(T_i) \geq \alpha$. Define

$$T = \left\{ (z_{n_0}^i) \cup (x_n)_{n \in H} : (x_n)_{n \in H} \in T_i \right\}.$$

Then T is a tree on Y such that $T \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $o(T) \geq \alpha + 1$.

Suppose α is a countable limit ordinal and the result holds for all $1 \leq \beta < \alpha$. Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$ be a regular family of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ satisfying the hypothesis such that $\iota(\mathcal{H}) \geq \alpha$. If $1 \leq \beta < \alpha$, then $\iota(\mathcal{H}) \geq \beta \geq 1$. Hence there exists a tree T_β on Y such that $T_\beta \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $o(T_\beta) \geq \beta$. Clearly the tree $T = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta$ satisfies the requirements of the proposition. □

Proof of Theorem 16. In view of 1. in Theorem 14, it suffices to show that $I_b(X) \geq \omega^{\omega^{\xi}} \cdot \alpha_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In order to set up to apply Proposition 21, let $Y = X$. Choose a sequence (q_k) as in Lemma 20 and fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let A_k

be a finite $\frac{\varepsilon\theta_n}{2(1+\varepsilon)}$-net of the unit sphere of $[e_j]_{j=q_k}^{q_{k+1}-1}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $c_n = \frac{\varepsilon\theta_n}{2(1+\varepsilon)}$ and set

$$\mathcal{X} = \{(y_k)_F : \emptyset \neq F \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha_n}[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\xi}],\ y_k \in A_k,\ \ (y_k) \overset{c_n}{\succeq} \ell^1(|F|)\text{-basis}\}.$$

Clearly $\mathcal{X}$ is hereditary. According to Lemma 20, whenever $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha_n}[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\xi}]$, there exist normalized vectors $(x_k)_{k\in F}$, supp $x_k \subseteq [q_k, q_{k+1})$, such that

$$\left|\left|\sum_{k\in F} a_k x_k\right|\right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon\theta_n}{1+\varepsilon}\sum_{k\in F}|a_k|$$

for all $(a_k) \in c_{00}$. Choose $(y_k)_{k\in F}$ such that $y_k \in A_k$ and $||x_k - y_k|| \leq \frac{\varepsilon\theta_n}{2(1+\varepsilon)}$ for all $k \in F$. For all $(a_k) \in c_{00}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left|\sum_{k\in F} a_k y_k\right|\right| &\geq \left|\left|\sum_{k\in F} a_k x_k\right|\right| - \left|\left|\sum_{k\in F} a_k (x_k - y_k)\right|\right| \\ &\geq \frac{\varepsilon\theta_n}{1+\varepsilon}\sum_{k\in F}|a_k| - \sum_{k\in F}|a_k|\,||x_k - y_k|| \\ &\geq \frac{\varepsilon\theta_n}{1+\varepsilon}\sum_{k\in F}|a_k| - \frac{\varepsilon\theta_n}{2(1+\varepsilon)}\sum_{k\in F}|a_k| \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon\theta_n}{2(1+\varepsilon)}\sum_{k\in F}|a_k|.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $(y_k)_{k\in F} \in \mathcal{X}$. By Proposition 21, there exists a tree T on X such that $T \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $o(T) \geq \iota(\mathcal{F}_{\alpha_n}[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\xi}]) = \omega^{\omega^\xi}\cdot\alpha_n$. Since $T \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, it is an ℓ^1-c_n-block tree. Thus $I_b(X) \geq \omega^{\omega^\xi}\cdot\alpha_n$. □

In general, the converse of Theorem 16 is far from true, as the following theorem shows.

Theorem 22. *Suppose that* $0 < \xi < \omega_1$, $(\alpha_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ *is a sequence of ordinals such that* $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}} \alpha_n = \omega^{\omega^\xi}$ *nontrivially (i.e.,* $\alpha_n < \omega^{\omega^\xi}$ *for all* n*) and* $(\theta_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ *is a nonincreasing null sequence in* $(0,1)$. *Then there exists a sequence* $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ *of regular families of finite subsets of* $\mathbb{N}$ *such that* $\iota(\mathcal{F}_n) = \alpha_n$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ *and* $I_b(T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)) = \omega^{\omega^\xi\cdot 2}$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 16 once we have obtained Proposition 24 below. □

Lemma 23. *Suppose that* $\omega \leq \beta < \omega_1$, *where* $\beta = \omega^{\beta_1}\cdot k_1 + \cdots + \omega^{\beta_m}\cdot k_m$ *in Cantor normal form, and* $g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ *is a function increasing to* ∞. *There exist regular families* $\mathcal{G}$ *and* $\mathcal{H}$ *such that* $\omega\cdot\iota(\mathcal{G}) = \omega^{\beta_1}\cdot k_1$, $\mathcal{S}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ *and* $\iota(\mathcal{H}) = \omega^{\beta_2}\cdot k_2 + \cdots + \omega^{\beta_m}\cdot k_m$. *In particular,* $\iota((\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{S}_1^g])) = \beta$. *(If* $m = 1$, *take* $\mathcal{H} = \emptyset$.*)*

Proof. Note that $\beta_1 > 0$ since $\beta \geq \omega$. Define

$$\mathcal{G} = \begin{cases} (\mathcal{S}_{\beta_1 - 1})^{k_1} & \text{if } 0 < \beta_1 < \omega \\ (\mathcal{S}_{\beta_1})^{k_1} & \text{if } \omega \leq \beta_1 < \omega_1 \end{cases}$$

and $\mathcal{H} = ((\mathcal{S}_{\beta_m})^{k_m}, \dots, (\mathcal{S}_{\beta_2})^{k_2})$. Clearly $\iota(\mathcal{H}) = \omega^{\beta_2} \cdot k_2 + \cdots + \omega^{\beta_m} \cdot k_m$ and

$$\omega \cdot \iota(\mathcal{G}) = \begin{cases} \omega \cdot \omega^{\beta_1 - 1} \cdot k_1 & \text{if } 0 < \beta_1 < \omega \\ \omega \cdot \omega^{\beta_1} \cdot k_1 & \text{if } \omega \leq \beta_1 < \omega_1 \end{cases} = \omega^{\beta_1} \cdot k_1.$$

□

If β is a nonzero countable ordinal whose Cantor normal form is $\omega^{\beta_1} \cdot k_1 + \cdots + \omega^{\beta_m} \cdot k_m$, write $\mathcal{R}_\beta$ for the family $((\mathcal{S}_{\beta_m})^{k_m}, \dots, (\mathcal{S}_{\beta_1})^{k_1})$.

Proposition 24. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 22, there exist regular families* $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ *and* $\mathcal{G}$ *with* $\iota(\mathcal{F}_n) = \alpha_n$, $\iota(\mathcal{G}) = \omega^{\omega^\xi}$, *and* $(q_m) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ *such that for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *and all* $F \in \mathcal{F}_n[\mathcal{G}]$, *there is a normalized sequence* $(x_m)_{m \in F}$ *such that* $\operatorname{supp} x_m \subseteq [q_m, q_{m+1})$ *and*

$$\left\| \sum_{m \in F} a_m x_m \right\| \geq \frac{\theta_n}{2} \sum_{m \in F} |a_m|$$

for all $(a_m) \in c_{00}$. *Here the norm* $\|\cdot\|$ *is taken in the space* $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{R}_{\alpha_0}$, $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{R}_{\alpha_1}$ and $g_1(k) = k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that g_n and $\mathcal{F}_n$ have been defined. If $\alpha_{n+1} < \omega$, let $\mathcal{F}_{n+1} = \mathcal{R}_{\alpha_{n+1}}$ and $g_{n+1} = g_n$. If $\alpha_{n+1} \geq \omega$, pick $x(k,n) \in c_{00}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

1. $\min \operatorname{supp} x(k,n) \geq k$,
2. $\|x(k,n)\|_{\ell^1} = 1/\theta_{n+1}$, and
3. $\|x(k,n)\|_{[\mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}, \mathcal{F}_0]} \leq \frac{1}{|A|}$ whenever $n_1, \dots, n_s \leq n$,

where $A = \{(n_1, \dots, n_s) : \theta_{n_1} \dots \theta_{n_s} > \theta_{n+1}\}$. Choose a nondecreasing function $g_{n+1} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $g_{n+1} \geq g_n$ and $\operatorname{supp} x(k,p) \subseteq [k, g_{n+1}(k))$ for all $1 \leq p \leq n$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then choose families $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{n+1}$ corresponding to α_{n+1} and g_{n+1} using Lemma 23. Finally, define $\mathcal{F}_{n+1} = \left(\mathcal{H}_{n+1}, \mathcal{G}_{n+1}\left[\mathcal{S}_1^{g_{n+1}}\right]\right)$. Note that $\iota(\mathcal{F}_n) = \alpha_n$ for all n. This completes the inductive definition of the families $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^\infty$.

Claim. If $\alpha_{n+1} \geq \omega$, then $\|x(k,n)\| \leq 2$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
Let $x = x(k,n)$ and suppose $\|x\| = \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}} t(E) \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{F}_0}$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is the set of all leaves of an $(\mathcal{F}_n)$-admissible tree. Take

$$\mathcal{E}' = \{E \in \mathcal{E} : h(E) = (0, n_1, \dots, n_s),\ (n_1, \dots, n_s) \in A\}$$

and $\mathcal{E}'' = \mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}'$. Now $E \in \mathcal{E}''$ only if $t(E) \leq \theta_{n+1}$. Therefore

$$\sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}''} t(E) \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \leq \theta_{n+1} \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}''} \|Ex\|_{\mathcal{F}_0} \leq \theta_{n+1} \|x\|_{\ell^1} = 1.$$

If $(n_1, \ldots, n_s) \in A$, let $\mathcal{L}_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)} = \{E \in \mathcal{E}' : h(E) = (0, n_1, \ldots, n_s)\}$. Now

$$\sum_{E \in \mathcal{L}_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)}} t(E)\, ||Ex||_{\mathcal{F}_0} \leq \sum_{E \in \mathcal{L}_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s)}} ||Ex||_{\mathcal{F}_0} \leq \|x\|_{[\mathcal{F}_{n_1},\ldots,\mathcal{F}_{n_s},\mathcal{F}_0]} \leq \frac{1}{|A|}$$

by condition 3. Hence

$$\sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}'} t(E)\, ||Ex||_{\mathcal{F}_0} \leq \sum_{(n_1,\ldots,n_s) \in A} \frac{1}{|A|} = 1.$$

Thus

$$\|x\| = \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}} t(E)\, \|Ex\| = \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}'} t(E)\, \|Ex\| + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}''} t(E)\, \|Ex\| \leq 2.$$

This proves the claim.

Since $\alpha_n < \sup_m \alpha_m = \omega^{\omega^\xi}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < \ldots$ such that $\sup_s \alpha_{n_s+1} = \omega^{\omega^\xi}$ and $\alpha_{n_s+1} \geq \omega$ for all $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that this implies by choice that $\sup_s \iota(\mathcal{G}_{n_s+1}) = \omega^{\omega^\xi}$. Now choose $q_1 < q_2 < q_3 < \ldots$ such that $q_{s+1} > \max \operatorname{supp} x(q_s, n_r)$, $1 \leq r \leq s$. Let $L = \{q_1, q_2, q_3, \ldots\} \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and $q(F) = \{q_m : m \in F\}$ for all $F \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty}$. Define

$$\mathcal{G} = \{F : s \leq F \text{ and } q(F) \in \mathcal{G}_{n_s+1} \text{ for some } s \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Then $\iota(\mathcal{G}) = \omega^{\omega^\xi}$. For $s \leq m$, $\operatorname{supp} x(q_m, n_s) \subseteq [q_m, g_{n_s+1}(q_m)) \in \mathcal{S}_1^{g_{n_s+1}}$. Hence if $s \leq F$, $q(F) \in \mathcal{G}_{n_s+1}$ for some $s \in \mathbb{N}$, and $x_m = \frac{x(q_m,n_s)}{\|x(q_m,n_s)\|}$ for all $m \in F$, then

$$\bigcup_{m \in F} \operatorname{supp} x_m \in \mathcal{G}_{n_s+1}\left[\mathcal{S}_1^{g_{n_s+1}}\right] \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{n_s+1}.$$

Thus, for all $(a_m) \in c_{00}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big\|\sum_{m \in F} a_m x_m\Big\| &\geq \theta_{n_s+1}\Big\|\sum_{m \in F} a_m x_m\Big\|_{\mathcal{F}_{n_s+1}} \\
&= \theta_{n_s+1}\Big\|\sum_{m \in F} a_m x_m\Big\|_{\ell^1} \\
&\geq \frac{\theta_{n_s+1}}{2}\sum_{m \in F} |a_m|\, \|x(q_m, n_s)\|_{\ell^1} \text{ by the claim,} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m \in F} |a_m| \text{ by condition 2.}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $F \in \mathcal{F}_n[\mathcal{G}]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, write $F = \bigcup_{s=1}^k F_s$ where $F_1 < \cdots < F_k$, $F_s \in \mathcal{G}$, $1 \leq s \leq k$, and $\{\min F_1, \ldots, \min F_k\} \in \mathcal{F}_n$. For $1 \leq s \leq k$, choose a normalized sequence $(x_m)_{m\in F_s}$ as above. Now for all $(a_m) \in c_{00}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\sum_{m\in F} a_m x_m\right\| &= \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(\sum_{m\in F_s} a_m x_m\right)\right\| \\ &\geq \theta_n \sum_{j=1}^{k}\left\|\sum_{m\in F_s} a_m x_m\right\| \\ &\geq \frac{\theta_n}{2}\sum_{m\in F}|a_m|.\end{aligned}$$

□

5. Standard Schreier families

For all limit ordinals $\alpha < \omega_1$, fix a sequence of ordinals strictly increasing to α. If $\beta = \omega^{\beta_1}\cdot m_1 + \cdots + \omega^{\beta_k}\cdot m_k$ is a limit ordinal, determine $\mathcal{S}_\beta$ using the sequence

$$\hat{\beta}_n = \begin{cases} \omega^{\beta_1}\cdot m_1 + \cdots + \omega^{\beta_k}\cdot(m_k - 1) + \omega^{\beta_k - 1}\cdot n & \text{if } \beta_k \text{ is a successor,} \\ \omega^{\beta_1}\cdot m_1 + \cdots + \omega^{\beta_k}\cdot(m_k - 1) + \omega^{\zeta_n} & \text{if } \beta_k \text{ is a limit,}\end{cases}$$

where (ζ_n) is the chosen sequence of ordinals increasing to β_k. It is clear that if α is a countable limit ordinal such that $\ell(\alpha) \leq \eta$ for some $\eta < \omega_1$, then $\left(\widehat{\omega^\eta \cdot m + \alpha}\right)_n = \omega^\eta\cdot m + \hat{\alpha}_n$ for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Throughout this section, we assume that the Schreier families $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ are defined using these choices. For such "standard" Schreier families, the converse of Theorem 16 holds. We begin by establishing some lemmas.

Lemma 25. *If α and η are countable ordinals such that $\ell(\alpha) \leq \eta$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\mathcal{S}_\alpha[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\eta\cdot m}] = \mathcal{S}_{\omega^\eta\cdot m+\alpha}$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on α. The case $\alpha = 0$ is clear. The result holds for $\alpha = 1$ by definition of $\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\eta\cdot m+1}$. Suppose the lemma is true for some α. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_{\alpha+1}[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\eta\cdot m}] &= (\mathcal{S}_1[\mathcal{S}_\alpha])[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\eta\cdot m}] = \mathcal{S}_1[\mathcal{S}_\alpha[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\eta\cdot m}]] \\ &= \mathcal{S}_1[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\eta\cdot m+\alpha}] = \mathcal{S}_{\omega^\eta\cdot m+\alpha+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Suppose α is a limit ordinal and the lemma holds for all $\gamma < \alpha$. By the remark above, $\omega^\eta\cdot m + \hat{\alpha}_n = \left(\widehat{\omega^\eta\cdot m+\alpha}\right)_n$ for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}&F \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\eta\cdot m}] \\ &\quad\Leftrightarrow F \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{\alpha}_n}[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^\eta\cdot m}] \text{ for some } n \leq \min F, \\ &\quad\Leftrightarrow F \in \mathcal{S}_{\omega^\eta\cdot m+\hat{\alpha}_n} \text{ for some } n \leq \min F \text{ by induction,} \\ &\quad\Leftrightarrow F \in \mathcal{S}_{\omega^\eta\cdot m+\alpha}.\end{aligned}$$

□

For the next theorem, fix a countable successor ordinal ξ and a nondecreasing sequence of ordinals $(\beta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\sup\limits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \beta_n = \omega^{\xi}$ nontrivially. Also let $\mathcal{F}_0$ be a regular family containing $\mathcal{S}_0$ such that $\iota\left(\mathcal{F}_0\right) = \alpha_0 < \omega^{\omega^{\xi}}$, and let $(\theta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a nonincreasing null sequence in $(0,1)$. In the present context, the ordinal $\gamma\left(\varepsilon, m\right)$ defined at the beginning of §4 becomes

$$\gamma = \gamma(\varepsilon, m) = \max\{\ell(\alpha_0) + \beta_{n_s} + \cdots + \beta_{n_1} : \varepsilon\theta_{n_1}\theta_{n_2}\ldots\theta_{n_s} > \theta_m\}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ ($\max\emptyset = 0$). Denote the immediate predecessor of ξ by $\xi - 1$.

Theorem 26. *Follow the notation above and apply the standard choices to define Schreier families. If there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $\beta < \omega^{\xi}$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $\gamma\left(\varepsilon, m\right)+2+\beta < \beta_m$, then $I_b\left(T\left(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{S}_{\beta_n})_{n=1}^{\infty}\right)\right) = \omega^{\omega^{\xi}\cdot 2}$. Otherwise, $I_b\left(T\left(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{S}_{\beta_n})_{n=1}^{\infty}\right)\right) = \omega^{\omega^{\xi}}$.*

Proof. If there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ with the above properties, then Theorem 16 yields that $I_b\left(T\left(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{S}_{\beta_n})_{n=1}^{\infty}\right)\right) = \omega^{\omega^{\xi}\cdot 2}$. Now assume that such ε does not exist. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $r = r\left(\varepsilon\right) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma\left(\varepsilon, m\right)+2+\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot r \geq \beta_m$. Let $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\beta_{m_0} > \ell(\alpha_0)+2+\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot r$. Fix $m \geq m_0$. In particular, $\gamma\left(\varepsilon, m\right) \neq 0$. Hence there exist $n_1, \ldots, n_s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varepsilon\theta_{n_1}\ldots\theta_{n_s} > \theta_m$ and $\ell(\alpha_0) + \beta_{n_s} + \cdots + \beta_{n_1} + 2 + \omega^{\xi-1}\cdot r \geq \beta_m$. Choose $r_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\ell(\alpha_0)+2 \leq \omega^{\xi-1}\cdot r_0$ and write $\beta_n = \omega^{\xi-1}\cdot r_n+\gamma_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $r_n \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ and $\gamma_n < \omega^{\xi-1}$. Then $r_0+r_{n_1}+\cdots+r_{n_s}+r \geq r_m$. If $r_n > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_{\beta_n} &= \mathcal{S}_{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot r_n+\gamma_n} = \mathcal{S}_{\gamma_n}\left[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot r_n}\right] \text{ by Lemma 25}\\ &\supseteq \mathcal{S}_{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot r_n}.\end{aligned}$$

The inclusion is obvious if $r_n = 0$. Therefore, using Lemma 25 again,

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot(r_0+r+1)}, \mathcal{S}_{\beta_{n_1}}, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_{\beta_{n_s}}\right] &\supseteq \left[\mathcal{S}_{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot(r_0+r+1)}, \mathcal{S}_{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot r_{n_1}}, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot r_{n_s}}\right]\\ &= \mathcal{S}_{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot(r_{n_s}+\cdots+r_{n_1}+r_0+r+1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\beta_m \leq \omega^{\xi-1}\cdot\left(r_0 + r_{n_1} + \cdots + r_{n_s} + r + 1\right)$, it follows from [11, Proposition 3.2(a)] that there exists $j_m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_{\beta_m} \cap [\mathbb{N}_{j_m}]^{<\infty} &\subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot(r_{n_s}+\cdots+r_{n_1}+r_0+r+1)}\\ &\subseteq [\mathcal{S}_{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot(r_0+r+1)}, \mathcal{S}_{\beta_{n_1}}, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_{\beta_{n_s}}],\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{N}_j$ is the integer interval $[j, \infty)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. By Proposition 1, there exists a sequence $(\ell_m) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ converging to ∞ such that, defining $\mathcal{F}_n$ to be $(\mathcal{S}_{\beta_n} \cap [\mathbb{N}_{\ell_n}]^{<\infty}) \cup \mathcal{S}_0$ for all $n \in$, $T\left(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{S}_{\beta_n})_{n=1}^{\infty}\right)$ is isomorphic to $T\left(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}\right)$. Let $k_m = \max\{j_m, \ell_{n_1}, \ldots, \ell_{n_s}\}$,

$$\mathcal{B}_m = \left\{B \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\infty} : \ell_m \leq B \text{ and } |B| \leq k_m\right\},$$

and define $\mathcal{H} = (\cup_{m=m_0}^{\infty}\mathcal{B}_m) \cup \mathcal{S}_{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot(r_0+r+1)}$. If $m \geq m_0$, then $\mathcal{F}_m \subseteq [(\mathcal{H})^2, \mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$. Indeed, if $F \in \mathcal{F}_m$, then $F \in \mathcal{S}_0$ or $F \in \mathcal{S}_{\beta_m} \cap [\mathbb{N}_{\ell_m}]^{<\infty}$.

In the former case it is clear that $F \in [(\mathcal{H})^2, \mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$. Suppose $F \in \mathcal{S}_{\beta_m} \cap [\mathbb{N}_{\ell_m}]^{<\infty}$. Then $F = F_1 \cup F_2$, where $F_1 = F \cap [\ell_m, k_m)$ and $F_2 = F \setminus F_1$. Clearly $F_1 \in \mathcal{B}_m \subseteq [\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} F_2 &\in \mathcal{S}_{\beta_m} \cap [\mathbb{N}_{k_m}]^{<\infty} \\ &\subseteq [\mathcal{S}_{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot(r_0+r+1)}, \mathcal{S}_{\beta_{n_1}} \cap [\mathbb{N}_{k_m}]^{<\infty}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{\beta_{n_s}} \cap [\mathbb{N}_{k_m}]^{<\infty}] \\ &\subseteq [\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mathcal{F}_m \subseteq [(\mathcal{H})^2, \mathcal{F}_{n_1}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{n_s}]$. This proves that the family $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon = (\mathcal{H})^2$ satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 13. Note that $\iota((\mathcal{H})^2) = \iota(\mathcal{H}) \cdot 2 = \omega^{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot(r_0+r+1)} \cdot 2$. Applying Proposition 13, we obtain

$$I_b\left(T\left(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}\right)\right) \leq \sup_{\varepsilon>0}\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} [\omega^{\omega^{\xi-1}\cdot(r_0+r(\varepsilon)+1)} \cdot 2 \cdot \omega^{\beta_n\cdot\omega}] = \omega^{\omega^{\xi}}.$$

Since the reverse inequality holds by Theorem 14, the proof is complete. ☐

It is worthwhile to record the statement of Theorem 26 for finite β_n's.

Corollary 27. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}_0$ is a regular family containing $\mathcal{S}_0$ such that $\iota(\mathcal{F}) < \omega^\omega$, and that (θ_n) is a nonincreasing null sequence in $(0,1)$ such that $\theta_{n+m} \geq \theta_n\theta_m$ for all $n, m \in$. Let $X = T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{S}_n)_{n=1}^\infty)$. If $\lim_m \limsup_n \theta_{m+n}/\theta_n > 0$, then $I(X) = \omega^{\omega\cdot 2}$. Otherwise, $I(X) = \omega^\omega$.*

We conclude by stating without proof a special case of the result when $\xi = 0$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\mathcal{A}_n$ to be the family of all subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ of cardinality $\leq n$.

Proposition 28. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}_0$ is a regular family containing $\mathcal{S}_0$ and $\iota(\mathcal{F}_0) < \omega$. Let (k_n) be a sequence in $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\lim k_n = \infty$ and $(\theta_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a nonincreasing null sequence in $(0,1)$. Denote the space $T(\mathcal{F}_0, (\theta_n, \mathcal{A}_{k_n})_{n=1}^\infty)$ by Y. Assume that every term $(\theta_n, \mathcal{A}_{k_n})$ is essential in the sense that there exists a nonzero $x \in Y$ such that $\|x\| = \theta_n \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \|E_j x\|$ for some $E_1 < \cdots < E_{k_n}$. Then $I_b(Y) = \omega$ if*

$$\inf_{r\in\mathbb{N}} \sup\Big\{\frac{\theta_m}{\theta_n} : k_m \geq r k_n\Big\} > 0.$$

Otherwise, $I_b(Y) = \omega^2$.

References

[1] D. E. Alspach and S. Argyros, Complexity of weakly null sequences, Diss. Math., 321 (1992), 1-44.

[2] D. E. Alspach, R. Judd and E. Odell, The Szlenk index and local ℓ_1-indices, preprint.

[3] S. F. Bellenot, Tsirelson Superspaces and ℓ_p, J. Funct. Anal. 69(1986), 207-228.

[4] J. Bourgain, On convergent sequences of continuous functions, Bull. Soc. Math. Bel., 32 (1980), 235-249.

[5] P. G. Casazza, W. B. Johnson and L. Tzafriri, On Tsirelson's space, Israel J. Math. 47 (1984), 81-98.

[6] T. Figiel and W. B. Johnson, A uniformly convex Banach space which contains no ℓ_p, Compositio Math. 29 (1974), 179-190.

[7] I. Gasparis, A dichotomy theorem for subsets of the power set of the natural numbers, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 129 (2001), 759-764.

[8] R. Judd and E. Odell, Concerning the Bourgain ℓ_1 index of a Banach space, Israel J. Math. 108 (1998), 145–171.

[9] D. Leung and W-K Tang, The ℓ^1-indices of Tsirelson type spaces, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. *To appear.*

[10] Edward Odell and Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann, On certain norms on Tsirelson's space, Illinois J. Math. 44 (2000), 51–71.

[11] Edward Odell, Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann, and Roy Wagner, Proximity to ℓ_1 and distortion in asymptotic ℓ_1 spaces, J. Funct. Anal. 150(1997), 101-145.

Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117543

E-mail address: `matlhh@nus.edu.sg`

Mathematics and Mathematics Education, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, 1 Nanyang Walk, Singapore 637616

E-mail address: `wktang@nie.edu.sg`